Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/764,339	STEINBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AARON W. CARTER	2624	
All Participants: Status of Application:			
(1) <u>AARON W. CARTER</u> .	(3)		
(2) Andrew V. Smith (Reg. No. 43,132).	(4)		
Date of Interview: 23 January 2009	Time:		
Type of Interview:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: Failure claims 63, 64 and 112 to further limit independent claims of claim 75 and potential 35 USC 101 rejection of claims 117 and 117 and 118 and 119		106, potential 35	USC 112(2nd)
Claims discussed: 63, 64, 75, 106, 108, 112, 117 and 121			
Prior art documents discussed: n/a			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	he substance
/Aaron W Carter/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner and the Applicant's representative discussed several issues with the amendment filed on 12/19/08. First is the failure of claims 63, 64 and 112 to further limit the claims from which they depend, it was agreed that an Examiner's amendment changing the dependency of claims 63 and 64 to depend on claim 59 would be made, and claim 112 would be cancelled. Next it was brought to the representative attention that claim 106, which is now in independent form, did not contain subject matter that was indicated as allowable in previous office action, see paragraph 10 of the action mailed on 9/29/08. It was agreed that an Examiner's amendment would be made adding the subject matter of claim 108 to claim 106. Next an antecedent basis issue with the limitation "the first faceprint" in line 30 of claim 75 was discussed and it was agreed that an Examiner's amendment would be made changing the limitation to state "a first faceprint". Finally, a potential 101 rejection of the claim 117 and 121 with regards to the "machine or transformation test" for process claims was discussed. It was agreed that an Examiner's amendment would be made to include the limitation "using a processor to perform the steps:" between lines 3 and 4 of both claims. As a result of the Examiner's amendments made the application is now in condition for allowance.